WORKING PAPER

Working Paper No.44

LABOUR MARKET SEGMENTATION IN A N STRUCTURAL CONTEXT AND ITS IMPLICA ON THE FEMALE LABOUR FORCE

by

U. Kalpagam

MADRAS INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
79, SECOND MAIN ROAD, GANDHINAGAR, ADYAR
MADRAS 600 020

Working Paper No.44

LABOUR MARKET SEGMENTATION IN A MULTI-STRUCTURAL CONTEXT AND ITS IMPLICATIONS ON THE FEMALE LABOUR FORCE

by

U. Kalpagam

MADRAS INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

79, Second Main Road, Gandhinagar,

Adyar, Madras 600 020

November, 1983

Acknowledgement

I thank Mr.J.Robinson for typing and Mr.K.C.Devassy for cyclostyling.

...

Abstract

In this paper, we develop further on the concept of labour market segmentation by introducing elements of patriarchy and capitalism in the analysis, based in the context of differentiated production structures that are co-existing and mutually interacting. The paper is in two sections. In the first part we present the nature of the industrial structure and the characteristics of the female industrial labour force in India, to understand the linkage between the two, and in the second section we draw out the implications of it for an analysis of the class dimensions of labour markets, job stratification and hierarchies, and how they affect the division of labour between men and women.

****

LABOUR MARKET SEGMENTATION IN A MULTISTRUCTURAL CONTEXT AND ITS IMPLICATIONS ON THE FEMALE LABOUR FORCE*

The main thrust of the 'theory of labour market segmentation' that developed in the West in the early seventies was to provide an alternative theoretical framework to the Neo-classical one to explain the observed discrimination in the labour markets. It was the contention of the theorists of labour market segmentation that there were deeply entrenched socio-cultural and institutional factors and not merely skill differentials that led to these discriminations. Here we make an exploratory theoretical attempt to develop further on this notion of labour market segmentation by introducing elements of patriarchy and capitalism in the analysis, based in the context of differentiated production structures that are co-existing and mutually interacting. The primary objective is to understand the implications for division of labour with its consequent effects on the type of labour used -- particularly female labour, of different kinds of production structures.

The paper will be in two sections. In the first part we present as it were, the nature of the Industrial structure and the characteristics of the female industrial labour force in India which will help us to understand the nature of the linkage between the two, and in section II we draw out the implications of it for an analysis of the class dimensions of labour markets, job stratification and hierarchies and occupational segregation, and how they affect the division of labour between men and women.

---

*I thank the members of the Institute, particularly Messrs C.T.Kurien, S.Guhan and Nasir Tyabji, who commented on an earlier draft of the paper without implicating them for any views or errors.

Section I

It is by now well recognised that on the eve of Independence in 1947, the Industrial Revolution in the country was far from complete.[1/] British colonial domination in the country affected the 'lower forms of production'[2/] in several contradictory ways. On the one hand it brought about the direct ruin of Indian handicrafts with the expansion of the capitalist factory sector taking place with a lag. On the other hand, the tendency to destroy the lower forms of production was also supplemented by tendencies to preserve and in some cases even encourage their expansion. Britain was interested in turning India into an agrarian and raw material appendage. The exploitation of the direct producers was therefore intensified and the chances of savings were minimised. This put a brake on the development of productive force and on the introduction of modern techniques.

The system of reproduction and the way of life in the countryside that took place on this basis, ensured the traditional demand for consumer and producer goods. There was thus a direct relation between the persistence of backward productive forces in agriculture and the preservation of the lower forms of production.

Apart from the fact of colonial domination which helped the small manufacturers to hold their ground, was their potentiality for unlimited exploitation of cheap labour. Where population growth acted as a natural constraint, the transition to factory production was complete, thus destroying the lower forms of production. But in agrarian economies with overpopulation, the aggregate supply of labour determined by population growth exceeded the aggregate demand for labour that is determined by the growth rate and capital formation, and the lower forms of production, given the slow rate of the development of productive forces persisted.

After Independence, the economic and political factors - the unequal distribution of national wealth and income leading to the demand for industrial products from a certain section, and the political factor in terms of the class of people who assumed power, were conducive to the idea of modern industrialisation. It was recognised particularly during the second plan period that priority will be given for heavy industry, i.e., the organisation of the production of the means of production, which in its turn will lead to the growth of consumer industries. It was also recognised at this time that efforts would be made to encourage the growth of the modern small sector i.e., the modern small capitalist sector. These plans provided merely for organising a system of reproduction on the national basis in the developed capitalist sector and it did not envisage a complete industrial revolution in the economy as a whole due to the predominance of the lower economic structures. Debates as to whether the Gandhian or Nehruian alternative is better led to compromise positions of state policy -- a heavy industries policy given by the Mahalanobis model along with the protection of village and rural industries. The post independence industrialisation strategy was once again geared towards the preservation and destruction of the lower forms of production, though in this instance it was a deliberate policy of the independent state in contrast to the earlier colonial situation.

The second aspect of India's industrialisation was the idea of mixed economy (ie) the coexistence and interaction of the public and private sectors, and the country's industrialisation was closely linked with a broad programme of state capitalist measures.

Industrialisation has thus been taking place in this country in conditions of a multistructural economy, where the lower structures are still significant in terms of labour force employed despite the fact that industrialisation and

general economic development has succeeded in transforming the lower structures and adapting them to meet the requirements of capitalist development. It is to be noted that these multistructures of production do not co-exist in isolation of each other but constitute a mutually interacting whole.

It is necessary to recognise and understand this multistructural nature of the economy, as an analysis and understanding of industrial labour markets has to be contexted within this articulated multistructural whole.

We will now in what follows present a picture of the industrial structure in the country and the accompanying structure of nonagrarian employment.[3/]

Table 1 shows the distribution of establishments (i.e) (1) Manufacturing, processing and servicing establishments, (2) Trade and Business establishments and (3) Other establishments including educational and public health institutions into government or quasi government, private and cooperative establishments. From Table 1 the following aspects are clear --

1) The industrial sector i.e., manufacturing, processing and servicing establishments account for 33.96 per cent of all establishments.[4/] Of these the private sector industrial establishments are 99.52 per cent. So whatever the size and growth of the public sector in terms of investment, output or employment, or in terms of its pervasive influence on the private sector, numerically the private sector units predominate the industrial scene.

2) Of the private sector industrial establishments, 2.44 per cent of the establishments are Registered factories,[5/] 33.57 per cent are Unregistered workshops[6/] and 59.99 per cent are Household enterprises.[7/] This shows that despite the massive industrialisation efforts since the Plan period, even as late

as 1971, numerically the Household enterprises predominated the manufacturing scene followed by a large section of unregistered workshops. Among both Registered factories and Unregistered workshops, government and quasi government units account for 0.72 per cent.

3) Of all industrial establishments, 65.3 per cent are in rural areas. Of these industrial establishments in Rural areas, Registered Factories account for 1.57 per cent, Unregistered workshops 24.08 per cent and Household enterprises 74.34 per cent. As is to be expected, Rural areas have more of Household units than non Household manufacturing units.

4) The Rural areas have also more Household industry units than the Urban areas. 81.05 per cent of Household industry units are in Rural areas while only 18.95 per cent are in Urban areas.

5) The establishments in the Rural areas are not predominantly manufacturing (or) industrial establishments. These account for only 35.69 per cent of all establishments in Rural areas.

6) Trade and Business establishments account for 20.80 per cent of all Rural establishments. Of these Rural Trade and Business establishments, Private Retail trade accounts for 79.05 per cent.

7) Of all Trade and Business establishments, Rural establishments account for 53.93 per cent, and Private establishments are 97.42 per cent. Of these Private Trade establishments, 4.18 per cent are Wholesale Trade establishments, 78.2 per cent are Retail establishments. In the trading sector it is the retail and small trading establishments that dominate.

We have thus far established the following aspects of the multistructural nature: The existence of different structures of industrial establishments apart from differences in the

nature of ownership. These are (a) Registered Factories which within themselves do not constitute a homogenous group in terms of technology or organisation of production can be construed as capitalist factory organisations using predominantly wage labour, and with a fairly recognised set of formal and legal codes of conduct regulating their capital-labour relationships. Whether in terms of employment or net value of output they are significant is yet to be seen, but numerically they constitute a very marginal portion of industrial establishments. (b) Unregistered workshops even if they are conceived of as capitalist enterprises and do use wage labour predominantly, their scale of employment and technology are generally lower than the Registered Factories and also do not have a set of formal and legal codes of conduct regulating their capital-labour relationship. (c) At the third level are Household industries which are dominant in the industrial scene and more so in the rural areas. By definition these are not factory organisations and even when they do use hired labour also necessarily use family labour either in work or supervision. While there are no formal and legal codes of conduct regulating the capital-labour relationship, in cases of Household industries using wage labour and Unregistered workshops, there is likely to exist codes of conduct regulating the capital-labour relationship either established informally and or through conventions.

Another aspect of the multistructural nature is the differences in industrial structure between rural and urban areas. While Unregistered workshops are dominant in urban areas, Household industries predominate in rural areas; and both Registered factories and Unregistered workshops are more in urban than in rural areas establishing the urban bias of capitalist industrialization.

All these different aspects of industrial structure outlined above has implications for the kind of employment structure that prevails, to which we shall now turn.

Tables II, III and IV show the distribution of Manufacturing, processing or servicing establishments of Household industries, Registered Factories and Unregistered Workshops according to size of employment. Analysis of these tables highlight the following.

1) Registered factories constituting 2.5 per cent of industrial establishments employ 44.05 per cent of industrial employment. The employment per unit works out to 62.80 persons. Unregistered workshops constituting 37.74 per cent of industrial establishments employ 26.05 per cent of industrial employment and the per unit employment works out to 2.52 persons Household industries comprising 59.7 per cent of industrial units employ 29.90 per cent of industrial employment and the per unit employment is 1.83 persons. The employment capacity of Registered Factories is higher than the Unregistered workshops or Household industries, which is as is to be expected given the larger scale of operation of Registered Factories generally.

2) Within different employment size categories of Registered factories, it is found that the number of units diminishes with higher employment groups but the total employment progressively increases.

3) For all size categories except 300-499 employment per unit in urban Registered factories is higher than in rural ones. This is likely to be related more to the product and technology mix of the industries so situated, rather than any efficiency in labour use in rural areas.

4) Among Unregistered workshops one person workshops constitute 38.4 per cent of the total and employ 15.26 per cent of the workforce in the unregistered units. One-person workshops thus have no hired labour nor any capital-labour distinction.

5) Both in terms of units and employment, Unregistered workshops in the size category of 2-4 workers is more dominant.

6) In general employment per unit in urban workshops is higher than in rural workshops except in the largest size category of 10-19 workers.

7) Regarding Household industry, one-person units account for 49.5 per cent of all units in Household industry category and provide 27.10 per cent employment of this sector. Thus atleast half of Household industry units in the country can be deemed to be purely family units not using any hired labour at all. Such units are more predominant in rural than in urban areas. Of all one-person units in Household industry 85.45 per cent one in rural areas.

8) The remaining 50 per cent of units in the Household industry, even while using family labour also use hired labour in different proportions.

9) Units employing 2-4 workers in the Household industry are 46.33 per cent and account for 60.08 per cent of employment in Household sector. Those employing over 4 workers are only 3.6 per cent comprising of 12.8 per cent of employment in the Household industry.

10) The rural-urban differences in the strength of Household industry is clear when we note that for every one unit in urban area, there are 4.28 units in rural areas and the urban-rural employment ratio works out to 1:3.36. Also in all size categories of employment in the Household industry, employment per unit is higher in urban than in rural areas.

Thus far we have examined the structure of employment corresponding to different industrial structures outlined earlier. We will now throw further light on that aspect both in terms of the sexwise distribution of workers as well as in terms of the class of workers. Analysis of Tables V(a) and (b)

showing the Industrial classification of workers in Household industry as main activity by sex[8] and class of workers[9] and the classification of workers in Non Household Trade, Business, Profession or Service as main activity by class of workers and sex, shows the following --

1) In Household industry females number 20.95 per cent of those employed.

2) Of the class of workers in Household industry Single workers are 42.64 per cent, Family workers 49.16 per cent and Employees 8.2 per cent.

3) Females among Employees are 26.16 per cent, among Single Workers 20.57 per cent and 32.2 per cent among Family workers.

4) Of all females in Household industry, 57.17 per cent are Family Workers, 34.72 per cent are Single Workers and 8.1 per cent are Employees, while among males in the Household industry 8.2 per cent are Employees, 45.42 per cent are Single workers and 47.03 per cent are Family Workers. While the proportion of Employees is the same among both males and females, the proportion of Single workers is higher among males than among females where Family Workers constitute the largest proportion.

5) There does not appear to be significant rural-urban differences.

Among Non-Household industry, Trade, Business, Profession or Service, females account for 10.14 per cent of all workers. (1) Of these 65.50 per cent are Employees, 23.73 per cent are Single workers and 9.45 per cent are Family workers. In urban areas the proportion of Employees is higher than the other two classes.

Let us recapitulate the aspects of the multistructural nature of the industrial sector as well as the structure of employment.

-- Existence of different industrial structures based on ownership, with a public sector in crucial industrial spheres in a state capitalist set up and a large private sector dependent on the public sector for its further growth.

-- In the private sector it is characterised by a large number of the lower forms of production, constituting of Household industries and Unregistered workshops with a variety of organisational forms.

-- The capitalist sector consists of different strata. A modern small capitalist sector and a small commodity producing sector in which labour has as yet been only formally subsumed under capital. By formal subsumption of labour to capital is meant that the labourer and the owner of the means of production are not the same and the owner of the means of production subordinates the labourer without any change the labour process. In these cases, capital only appropriates absolute surplus value, in contradistiction to a phase of production where technological change changes the labour process such that capital appropriates relative surplus value also.10/ There is likely to be a overlap of these in the census categories of unregistered workshops and Registered factories in smaller size categories of employment as well as in large size category of Household industry using hired labour.

-- At the other end of the spectrum is the monopoly capitalist sector with a significant amount of asset, product and market concentration, and dependent on foreign capital and technology in a number of ways and with variegated forms of production organisation.

-- Closely allied to the industrial sector is the trade and commerce, transport and service sector, each with its diverse forms.

This multistructural feature also generates a structure of employment. We have so far seen some of the types -- namely the extent of the use of wage labour and family labour in different types of industry and the different classes of workers such as Employee, Single worker and Family Worker. The combination differs according to the different structures and as between rural and urban areas.

Section II

In this section we analyse the implications of the multistructural economy for an analysis of the class dimensions of labour market, occupational segregation, job-stratification and hierarchies and how they affect the division of labour. For this purpose we shall take up each of these structures at a time and then analyse the implications.

Household Industry -- i) Single Worker type -- This type is not different from a craftsman in the sense that the labourer is not separate from the owner of the means of production. This is the second dominant group in Household industry category. In this case it is quite possible that the single worker is either independent in the sense the worker makes the goods either to order or sells directly to the market; or the worker is dependent on a merchant or middlemen for either one or all of the requirements -- raw materials, credit and market. In some cases the single worker is also dependent on the merchant or middlemen for his tools. While there are no exact statistics on this, it is more likely that among female single workers who constitute 17.06 per cent of single workers, the chances of their being dependent are higher. In such cases of dependence, the single worker is for all purposes a seller of his/her commodity labour power where the sale and purchase is not mediated through any formal market institutions, and where the price of labour power

(ie) wage, is realised through commodity price differentials rather than in the form of money wage as such. In some cases, especially when working under some form of 'putting out' system, the single worker will get a formal wage. Thus we see that the Single Worker type Household industry is a broad category encompassing in it the independent craftsmen who works to order, an independent craftsmen producing for the market (ie) a small commodity producer using no hired labour, a dependent craftsmen dependent on the merchant or middlemen for market (ie) working for a 'buyer-up', the degree of dependence sometimes being such as it can be construed a case of the craftsmen selling his labour power to the merchant or middlemen, and also cases when it is explicitly recognised by all concerned that he in fact is a wage-worker receiving a formal wage.

(ii) Family Worker type. Unlike the single worker case, this implies that the worker is one among the other family members involved in the industry. Here again the family itself can be either dependent or independent. In all aspects it is similar to the above single worker case. Occasionally when a formal wage is received, it is generally in the form of piece rate for the job done. The striking feature that distinguishes it from the 'single worker' case above, is that in Household enterprises using family labour, there is a recognised division of labour within the family for the marketed work. The division of labour in such cases is strikingly different from the capitalist division of labour. Under the latter the labour power of the members involved is treated as a commodity, whereas under division of labour in the Family Worker Household Industry type, the family labour power is not yet a commodity, even when a piece rate is paid for the job done. This is not only because of the lack of any formal market institutions mediating the sale and purchase of that labour power but also because most often family labour is only deemed to be helping the 'main worker' or 'head of the household', and the family labour is treated as housework.

It is particularly important to note the perception of family labour Domestic industry as an appendage of manufacture, where piece rates are paid is generally construed as capitalist domestic industry, implying that the piece-rate involves the sale and purchase of labour power. However the treatment of family labour within this is not quite clear. It appears to us that there are certain grey areas in this. If the production process involves necessarily the use of family labour then the family is the unit of employment. The piece rate paid should then take into account this factor. Also in case of Domestic/Household industry, it is generally recognised that wage cost is lower, than if they were employed individually in a factory. To that extent, part of the labour power cannot be treated as a commodity. Also there are instances where the production process does not necessarily involve family labour and is not recognised by the 'buyer-up' whether it be a factory or merchant, but infact, family labour is used, in which case again it is not a commodity labour power. Another implication of this family division of labour is that unlike the capitalist division of labour which is geared to generation of greater surplus value, here it is invariably the process and product of patriarchal domination. By patriarchal domination is here meant a social system where the prevailing ideology of gender relations is such that the man is recognised to be the provider and protector of the family. In such a case, we know that the task assignment in the sphere of production is done by the man and the nature of the task assignment, which is most likely to be arrived at after considering the spheres of activity assigned to woman in the house, is of such a nature that the chances of skill acquisition particularly, are low for the women. In spheres of production activity where processes are done simultaneously and which involves female family labour, women are sometimes found to do tasks of greater drudgery. While Family Workers constitute the largest section among Household industry workers (49%), among females Family workers are 57.17 per cent.

iii) Household Industry with employees -- In this category the enterprise is carried on at the household level with hired labour. Unlike the factory production, the owner not only undertakes risks of business, but is invariably also actively involved both in supervision of work as well as does work. While hired labour is used, family labour is also used depending upon the scale of operation. A classic example of this kind would be a master weaver with half-a-dozen or so looms at home. If the scale of operation is small, both the man and women are involved in work, and also most times the children too. Otherwise both are invariably involved in supervision. This shows that once the need to extract surplus value from hired labour becomes important, the former patriarchal division of labour within the family for marketed work breaks down, and both the man and woman are jointly involved in their common objective. In this case the division of labour among hired workers is both an extension and modification of patriarchal division of labour that existed when the scale of operation involved only family labour. The remnants of the earlier feature -- patriarchal division of labour assigning women to tasks with less skills and greater drudgery and the fact the women's labour power in the earlier stage was not treated as a commodity -- even now reinforces a discounted rate on women's labour power. Mobility of women to tasks not hitherto assigned to them is invariably linked to the availability of male workers. It is this market factor that sets in the modification to patriarchal division of labour.

Unregistered workshops -- The distinguishing feature of these is the nonexistence of family labour. Though it is not uncommon to find a son work in his father's workshop, it is either to take over the workshop from the father or to go as a wage worker elsewhere, but the son's or family labour is not viewed as an integral or necessary part of the labour process. There are then three different structures of employment generated here.

i) Unregistered Workshops with single workers -- This is like the single worker Household industry case. Here the worker is not separated from the ownership of the means of production. But unlike the Household industry case, in this organisational structure whether he is dependent on orders on a larger unit or accepts it directly independently, there is likely to be a greater degree of formal integration with the market economy. The single worker here rarely receives a wage but the income that accrues is the difference between the cost of the job performed and charges fixed. So the income is a composite of both wage income as well as a profit.

ii) Unregistered Workshops using hired labour -- involves the small capitalist owner in different degrees of supervision and work. The smaller the scale of operation he is more likely to be a worker than a supervisor. As there are no formal codes of conduct, the capital-labour relationship is informal. This has implications for wage fixing and wage payment arrangements. In jobs that are unskilled or with a low skill component as is likely to be for these workshops, and the fact of a labour surplus situation in general, the greater the informality, the greater the control and authority of the owner on wage fixing and wage payments. And this control, given the informality, is also mixed with attitudes of a patron and a patriarch. In this situation not only would the supply price of labour be low given the labour surplus context, but we would also expect the wage rate to be equal to the supply price of labour for whatever each quantity of labour used. That is, the wage rate for each worker is likely to be the minimum at which he will offer to work.

As for division of labour, both unregistered workshops and Registered factories in smaller employment size categories are examples of situations where labour has been formally subsumed under capital, except in the case of modern small industries using sophisticated technology, where the nature of the technology and capital intensity dictates the small size of employment.

This implies that while labour and capital are formally divorced from each other and capital receives a surplus value, it takes over the labour process as it were prior to the subsumption. So there is no reorganisation of production. In these cases, the former labour process that is the outcome of both patriarchal division of labour and its modification persists. This is not to rule out wage differentials which are to be explained in terms of patriarchal-capitalist authority and the discounted rate on women's labour power. Substantively in this phase there is less likelihood of worsening of women's position through changes in division of labour or a significant advantage in working in a workshop or factory based production than as wage employees in Household industry.

In capitalist production organisations of Factory type using sophisticated technology corresponding to the phase of real subsumption of labour to capital, there is a reorganisation of the labour process in such a way as to increase productivity. This phase of reorganisation introduces job hierarchies and stratification as well as greater and greater bureaucratic control of labour. Hitherto the analysis of labour markets pertained only to an external labour market that the units faced and conventional economic analysis only deals with external labour markets in its analysis. Job stratification and hierarchies also leads to the formation of an internal labour market. The analysis of labour markets in these situations have therefore to take into account both these labour markets. The formation of internal labour markets is yet another phase of consolidation of capitalist authority over the labour force. The implication of this is that not all jobs within a firm are equally available to all potential employees. The functions that the market performed in selection under external market situation are now internalised by firm itself, in such a way it has become an instrument to enforce and perpetuate discrimination and enhance capitalist aggrandisment.[11/]

We will now examine some of the reasons for enterprise level reorganisation of the labour process. The difference between patriarchal division of labour and capitalist division of labour was made out earlier. The crucial feature of capitalist division of labour is the tendency on the part of capital to constantly maximise its surplus value. For the present purpose we shall treat it as profits. Then for a given quantum of value added, profits can be maximised, if the wage bill is kept to a minimum. This implies attempts to minimise both the average wage rate and/or the aggregate quantum of labour. Let us consider the average wage rate as an average of wage rates of different jobs. One aspect of the capitalist reorganisation of the labour process is the tendency for job splitting and thereby creating a regime of payment and promotion according to skills. We then expect that through greater and greater job splitting, it is possible to reduce the wage rate for some jobs, either perhaps through a reduction in skill component for the job or through a time reduction for performing the job or both even while it increases the wage rates of other jobs in such a way that the average wage rate is lowered. The quantum of labour and labour time is reduced through labour saving technology, introducing time and motion studies, better production organisation and greater control and supervision of labour. These two aspects have implications for the type of labour used. First, we have already said that job stratification leads to the internal labour market. Jobs within the enterprise are stratified on the basis of specific skills required. Those who have the skills and those who can acquire the skills are the ones eligible both while moving up the job hierarchy and while being recruited directly. In a class society where ability to acquire skills is not uniform and where there involves a private cost of skill acquisition, the eligible set gets smaller and smaller in the higher echelons of job hierarchy. Consequently we find that only persons of certain economic status are positioned at different levels on the job hierarchy. If the class position in society is also conditioned historically by the

caste factor as in the Indian context, then it takes time for caste groups which have a generally lower economic position to be high up in the hierarchy, even when there is an active reservation policy facilitating skill acquisition for these groups. Also as is well known in the Indian case, even within caste groups, those economically better are obviously in higher positions.

This does not stop with merely class and caste, but also extends to gender. In patriarchal societies where differential gender roles are deeply entrenched and where women's labour power is commoditified much later, it is to be noted that they are the last to acquire certain skills that are outside the domain of traditional skills alloted to them through patriarchal division of labour. Also it is generally accepted that men do not have to acquire the 'traditional skills' of women. This leads to skewness in job hierarchy not only in terms of economic status and caste but also gender.

Numerous case studies both within and outside the country point to the fact that women are 'crowded out' to jobs that involve drudgery, low skill, low wage, less stable, involving 'nimble fingers' and docility. While each of these factors is likely to be in operation, along with perhaps a conscious discrimination by the employers given the patriarchal norms of society, these are merely symptomatic of an underlying economic process. Earlier we had observed how the average wage rate gets progressively diminished through job splitting under a developed capitalist division of labour. In such cases there might always arise a set of jobs for which the wage rate is below the reserve price of male labour. It is clear that for those sections of workers for whom survival is the basic goal, they are involuntarily employed by the need for survival rather by any choice. And in a society with patriarchal norms it is to be noted that women from this section come on to the labour market after the men merely to meet the subsistence level of income. This is not tantamount

to saying that women are supplementary earners. Even if they come on the labour market not as the first worker in the family, they might contribute more to family income and expenditure than the first earners. We notice that for this section of workers the female labour supply becomes an increasing function of the difference between the family income which is a social subsistence level of income and the actual income of the head of the household who in most cases is the male. Given this situation and the fact of the general labour surplus nature of the economy we expect the reserve price of male labour to be higher than the reserve price of female labour. This explanation of the wage rate falling below the reserve price of male labour and the fact of differences in the reserve price of male and female labour can be countered by the fact that there is no full employment situation for men, and also given the fact that males have to provide for the family, there is no reason to expect the reserve price of male labour to be higher than that of female labour. While the logic of this appears reasonable, it has to be noted that while the reserve price of male labour is higher than the reserve price of female labour in general, there is no reason to assume a uniform economy wide reserve prices for male and female labour. Labour supply functions for each industry or occupation are separate with different levels of reserve prices and with different slopes of the supply curve, but with the reserve price for female labour being below the reserve price of male labour. The implication of this is that there exist specific individual preferences apart from wage rates, subsistence requirements, skills etc for the kind of occupation and industry, such that it is unlikely that individuals are completely mobile across all industries and occupations. Occupational mobility is restricted to a certain set for each individual conditioned apart from other factors by subjective preferences. To take an extreme case of jobs that are indistinguishable from vagrancy, an individual has an option of being either an able bodied beggar or a rag picker. We have thus far

tried to provide an explanation for job hierarchy and 'crowding out' of female workers at an enterprise level under a developed capitalist labour process.

Recapitulating thus far, we have analysed the nature of the labour process under different forms of production in a multistructural context, and traced its implications on the female labour force, as well as the economic process through which it works. The salient features of our analysis are:

1) Conceptually we reject the notion of a 'gender or gender based division of labour'. Rather we characterise the division of labour in terms of the form of production organisation. Thus we have a 'patriarchal division of labour' and a 'capitalist division of labour'. Had we analysed a jajmani system of production, we would have characterised a 'communal division of labour' also.

2) The different forms the division of labour takes under different forms of production organisation has different implications for the type of labour used -- in this case female labour.

a) Under Household production using only family labour, there is a patriarchal division of labour, where women's tasks are assigned by the man and where women's labour power is not yet a commodity.

b) Under Household production using predominantly hired labour as well as unregistered workshops, we notice that these are capitalist forms of organisation where the labour has been only formally subsumed under capital, and there is no reorganisation of the labour process. In these cases, the former patriarchal division of labour modified by market conditions prevail. There is little change in women's position in terms of task assignment, except that female labour power is now a commodity. While apparently it appears that women's position

has not worsened in terms of task assignment, it has to be noted that increases in absolute surplus value in these forms of production organisation are got only through prolonging the working hours and by deplorable working conditions. Earlier we had noticed that these are units where there are no formal and legal codes of conduct regulating the capital-labour relationships.

c) Under factory form of production, it is an advanced capitalist production where labour's subsumption to capital is 'real' and is followed by a reorganisation of the labour process to increase the relative surplus value. Through this process female labour tends to get 'crowded out' to tasks with wage rates lower than the reserve price of male labour.

We had at the beginning said that the "analysis of industrial labour markets has to be contexted within this articulated multistructural whole". We have so far however only highlighted the multistructural nature and its implications for division of labour. We will now show how these multistructures are articulated and its implications on the labour force.

These different structures imply different costs of extracting a certain quantum of surplus (ie) different profit rates. In the case of Household industry using family labour it is clear that surplus is extracted in the form of unpaid family labour apart from the usual surplus from paid labour. In the case of Household industry and Unregistered workshops using hired labour, as already mentioned, increases in surplus are obtained by increasing working hours. These are in actual fact sweat shops where the full cost of surplus extraction is borne by labour. In Capitalist factory production the cost of increases in surplus extraction is borne only to a certain limit by labour in terms of increased working hours. Beyond that, where scope exists increases in surplus value are obtained through new technology and reorganisation of production.

It is the prevalence of these different structures with different costs involved for a certain quantum of surplus, that leads to these different structures to exist, not as isolated ones but articulated to each other. The forms that articulation takes however differs in each concrete case. Broadly the following forms are usually noticed.

1) Household industry of both the single worker and family labour type being made dependent on a merchant or a large producer under some form of 'putting out' system.

2) Household industry with family as a unit -- In certain occupations the entire family becomes the hired unit and not the individual.

3) Household industry and unregistered workshops using hired labour, the person who hires and organises may be contractor for a merchant.

4) These may also act as subcontractors to larger capitalist factories. In these cases it is possible that the large unit subcontract the entire production of the good, which normally happens when there is a peak demand and an excess of orders over their capacity. The employment in these units is highly unstable, and only those individuals who are not the first to enter the labour market from the family will be willing to accept this unstable work. This of course does not imply that in all cases of unstable jobs only women are employed. If there are other overriding conditions such as a particular organisation of production requiring women, then instability is not the criterion. [For e.g., In the Export Garments Industry in Madras city units with stable production had a different form of production organisation than the unstable ones and consequently female labour was used in stable units than on unstable units]. It is then clear that the larger unit does not like to expand productive capacity merely to cater to their peak demand.

5) It is also possible that these units that are subcontractors to larger factories do not produce the whole good but are engaged only in certain processes. In these cases firms have a number of objectives while subcontracting out certain processes -- jobs that can be done at home like embroidery for certain export garments in Delhi are done at home, jobs which are more labour intensive and where the firm does not like to be burdened with a large labour force not only in terms of supervision but also inviting upon itself all factory legislations, in industries where unionisation is getting underway and if technically it is possible to diffuse the labour force, and also in terms of incurring a lower wage cost or extracting greater absolute surplus value through sweated production. In the ultimate analysis such subcontracting of processes of production increases their profits than otherwise. It is also true, as mentioned earlier that in these forms of organisations there has been no significant reorganisation of the labour process, unlike the capitalist factory production where the capitalist labour process introduces 'job crowding out' for female workers. This implies that in industries where female labour is used, in these two forms of production organisation (ie) Household industry and Unregistered workshops using hired labour, there would exist a larger number of jobs performed by women whose wage rates would be lower than the corresponding jobs done under an advanced capitalist factory production where it is probably taken over by men. This reduces the wage cost of the job under these two organisations.

6) Another way in which these different structures are articulated is to confine the production of wage goods in structures where the wage goods would be turned out cheapter, so that the subsistence requirements of wage labour in the advanced capitalist sectors could be met more cheaply. While this logic is very appealing, very little work on this aspect has been done on this so far.

The logic of the above point takes us to another important domain of analysis that has been avoided so far, namely the relationship between Housework and Productive work. Without going into the nuances of this debate let us state briefly that if labour power is to be reproduced, then the full cost of reproduction of labour power has to be taken into account. Reproduction of labour power entails the labourer to be engaged not only in production but also in reproduction. Family labour expended to replace the effort lost in production so as to maintain the labourer like cooking and nurturance, as well as the costs associated with raising and caring for children has to be accounted for in the cost of labour power. If these services are not provided by the family, then either these would have to be marketed or socialised, the former entailing a price for the service and the latter a cost to society. An argument analogous to the above has been developed in the context of migrant labour where the reproduction needs of the workers in the urban capitalist sectors are met by the rural subsistence sector.[12/] It is necessary that a social subsistence wage also includes the full cost of reproduction.

We have made in this paper an exploratory attempt at examining the nature of labour market segmentation in a multistructural context, and in particular the implication for division of labour under different production structures. We call it exploratory as we recognise that much more needs to be worked out to make it a logically neat and rigorous whole.

****

Table I : Distribution of establishments by broad types - 1971 All India

	Total A - Govt. or Quasi Govt., Rural B Private	Manufacturing, Processing or servicing establishments: Total No. of ests.	Regis-tered facto-ries	Unreg. work-shop	House-hold inds.	Trade or Business establishments: Whole-sale	Retail	Others	Other establishments: Edn. Instit-utions	Public Health insti-tution	Others
India Total	A	917141	2799	7310	-	2180	17560	34071	404146	60888	388187
	B	9253607	84578	1302651	2080054	175226	3278873	738720	152795	127652	1313058
	C	89336	1861	4780	-	3944	28463	24975	1656	340	23317
Rural	A	702845	998	3544	-	1156	9542	18243	363256	47218	258858
	B	5589480	33648	539687	1683846	30288	1835009	388762	106409	58080	911751
	C	59769	1012	2729	-	2304	18202	17764	948	165	16645
Urban	A	214296	1801	3766	-	1024	8018	15798	40890	13670	129329
	B	3664127	50930	762964	394208	144938	1443864	349958	46386	69572	401307
	C	29567	849	2051	-	1640	10261	7211	708	175	6672

Source: Table E1 - Establishment Tables Part III-B(i) - Series 1 - India, Census of India 1971

TABLE II

Distribution of Manufacturing, processing or servicing establishments other than household industries classified by Registered Factories, Unregistered workshops and size of employments - All India 1971

Division I — Number of Factories or Workshops other than household industries by size of Employment

Major Group NIC	Total		10-19		20-49		Registered Factories 50-99		100-299		300-499		500 -		Per uns fie
	Units	Persons	Units	Persons	Units	Persons	Units	Persons	Units	Persons	Units	Persons	Units	Persons	
2 & 3(T)	89238	5603892	37979	480065	32793	927965	9613	616114	5814	893388	936	347203	1586	2339157	
2 & 3 (Rural)	35658	1775123	13417	165223	14584	409018	4385	277422	2246	336845	290	107701	470	478914	
2 & 3 (Urban)	53580	3828769	24562	314842	18209	518947	5228	338692	3568	556543	646	239502	1116	1360243	

Source: EII - PART A - Establishment Tables Part III-B (i) Series 1-India, Census of India 1971

Table III : Number of factories or workshops other than household industries by size of employment - All India 1971

Unregistered factories

vision	Total		One person		2 - 4		5 - 9		10 - 19		Unspecified
	U	P	U	P	U	P	U	P	U	P	U
(Total)	1314741	3313481	505510	505510	626742	1590463	143267	902394	25053	315114	14169
(Rural)	545960	1215517	246634	246634	239559	585880	42535	265237	9302	117766	7930
(Urban)	768781	2097964	258876	258876	387183	1004583	100732	637157	15751	197348	6239

Source: EII-Part A, Establishment Tables - Part II-B(i), Series-1 India, Census of India 1971.

Table IV : Distribution of household industry establishments classified by industry and size of employment - All India 1971

Number of household industry establishments by size of employment

Division	Total Units	Total Persons	One units	2 - 4 U	2 - 4 P	5 - 9 U	5 - 9 P	10 - 19 U	10 - 19 P	Person unspecified U
(Total)	2080054	3803747	1030766	963649	2285466	67952	404570	6945	82945	10742
(Rural)	1685846	2931627	880755	749487	1750064	42800	252705	4034	48103	8770
(Urban)	394208	872120	150011	214162	535402	25152	151865	2911	34842	1972

Source: EII-Part C, Establishment Tables Part II-B(i), Series-1 India Census of India 1971

Table V-a - Industrial classification of workers in manufacturing, processing, servicing, and repairs on household industry basis as main activity by sex and class of workers All India - 1971

	Total		Employees		Single workers		Family workers		Employers	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
2&3 - Mfg and Repair										
Total	5021251	1330869	421964	108030	2246570	462034	2361717	760805	--	--
Rural	3764281	999067	292381	78464	1709601	361271	1762299	559332	--	--
Urban	1256970	331802	120583	29566	536969	100763	599418	201473	--	--

Table V -b - Classification of workers in Non Household Industry, Trade, Business, Profession or service as main activity by class of workers and sex

Total	43463801	4908408	27040080	3214955	11943739	1164701	2306276	463902	2173706	64850
Urban	24587376	2278464	16354232	1693336	6076327	476597	677460	77031	1479357	31500

Source: Tables B-IV Parts B C, General Economic Tables Part II-B(iii), Series-1 India, Census of India 1971.

Notes

1/ This section is drawn largely from G.K. Shirokov - "Industrialisation of India", Progress Publishers: Moscow, 1973.

2/ While Shirokov uses the term 'lower forms of production', there is no clear definition given in the text. For a better understanding of the concept of 'lower forms of production', see V.I.Lenin - "The Development of Capitalism in Russia", Collected Works Volume 3, Progress Publishers: Moscow 1976 and V.I. Pavlov -- "Historical Premises for India's transition to Capitalism", Nauka Publishing House, Moscow 1979. Lenin identified the following forms of production -- domestic industries, small commodity production in industry and their differentiation, capitalist simple cooperation, capitalist manufacture and large scale factory production. By lower forms of production is generally understood to be those stages of production where the machine has not completely taken over manual production and where there does not exist a well developed capitalist division of labour.

3/ In our analysis we would use 1971 as the reference year, for it is only for 1971 that all data was readily available.

4/ The 1971 census definition of an 'establishment', 'Registered factory', 'Unregistered Workshop' and 'Household industry' is as follows: 'Establishment' -- An establishment is a place where goods are produced or manufactured not solely for domestic consumption or where servicing and/or repairing is done such as factory, workshop or household industry or servicing and/or repair workshop or a place where retail or wholesale business is carried on or commercial services and rendered or an office, public or private or a place of entertainment or where education, religious, social or entertainment services are rendered. It is necessary that in all these places one or more persons should be actually working. Thus an establishment will cover manufacturing, trade and other establishments where people work. The employment data from the "Establishment Tables' of the 1971 census are lower than the employment figures from the 'General Economic Tables'. This discrepancy does not vitiate our analysis,which only considers these categories to show they are not empty or nonexistent.

5/ 'Registered factory' -- A factory which is registered under the Indian factories Act should be treated as a 'Registered factory'. Any other workshop merely licensed by the Municipal or any other authority or registered for any other purpose should not be treated as a registered factory unless it is registered under the Indian factories Act.

6/ 'Unregistered Workshop' -- Workshop is a place where some kind of 'production' processing, servicing, repairing or making of goods for sale is going on. A workshop which is registered under the Indian Factories Act should be treated as a registered factory and other as 'unregistered workshops'. Workshops which are run as household industry whould be treated as household industry.

7/ 'Household Industry' -- A 'household industry' is defined as an industry conducted by the Head of the household himself/herself and or mainly by the members of the household at home or within the village in rural areas, and only within the premises of the house where the 'household lives in urban areas. The industry should not be run on the scale of "registered factory".

8/ The definition of 'Worker' in 1971 severely ender-estimated the number of female workers in general and more so in particular groups as 'cultivators' and 'Household industry'. As we are not portraying any change over the years, we have taken the figures as such, keeping in mind that the figures for female workers in Household industry are under-estimated.

9/ The 1971 Census defined and identified the following classes of workers -- "Employer", "Employee", "single worker" and Family Worker".

'Employer' -- An employer is a person who has to employ other persons in order to perform the work. That is to say, such a person is not only responsible for his own personal work but also for giving work to others in business. But a person who employs domestic servants for household duties or has subordinates under him in an office where he is employed by others is not an employer, even if he has the power to employ another person in his office on behalf of his own employer or employers.

'Employee' -- An employee is a person who usually works under some other persons for salary or wages in cash or kind. There may be persons who are employed as managers, superintendents, agents etc., and in that capacity employ or control other workers on behalf of their own employers. Such persons are only employees, as explained above, and should not be regarded as employers.

'Single Worker' -- A single worker is a person who works by himself. He is not employed by any one else and in his turn does not employ anybody else, not even members of his household except casually. This definition of a single worker will include a person who works in joint partnership with one or several persons hiring no employees, and also a member of a producer's cooperative. Each one of the partners or members of such producers' cooperatives should be regarded as 'Single Worker'.

'Family Worker' -- A family worker is a member who works without receiving wages in cash or kind, in an industry, business, trade or service. For example, the working members in a family or Dhobies where they all participate and each does not receive wage separately will be family workers. These may be family workers in industry, trade or professions as well. For the purpose of this definition members of a family may be drawn from beyond the limits of the household by ties of blood or marriage. The family worker may not be entitled to a share of the profits in the work of the business carried on either by the person or Head of the Household or other relative.

10/ For an understanding of the concepts "Formal and Real Subsumption of Labour to Capital", see Karl Marx - Capital Vol.1 Appendix: Results of the Immediate Process of Production, Penguin 1976. p. 1019 -- "The labour process is subsumed under capital (it is its own process) and the capitalist intervenes in the process as its director, manager. For him it also represents the direct exploitation of the labour of others. It is this that I refer to as the formal subsumption of labour under capital. It is the general form of every capitalist process of production; at the same time, however it can be found as a particular form alongside the specifically capitalist mode of production in its developed form, because although the latter entails the former, the converse does not necessarily obtain (i.e. the formal subsumption can be found in the absence of the specifically capitalist mode of production)." p.1021 --"All this notwithstanding, this change (of formal subsumption of labour under capital) does not in itself imply a fundamental modification in the real nature of the labour process, the actual process of production. On the contrary, the fact is that capital subsumes the labour process as it finds it, that is to say it takes over on existing labour process, developed by different and more archaic modes of production. And since that is the case it is evident that capital took over an available, established labour process." "If changes occur in these traditional established labour processes after their take over by capital, these are nothing but the gradual consequences

of that subsumption. The work may become more intensive, its duration may be extended, it may become more continuous or orderly under the eye of the interested capitalist, but in themselves these changes do not effect the character of the actual labour process, the actual mode of working. This stands in striking contrast to the development of a specifically capitalist mode of production (large scale industry and 'real subsumption); the latter not only transforms the situations of the various agents of production, it also revolutionises their actual mode of labour and the real nature of the labour process as a whole. It is in contradistinction to this last that we come to designate as the formal subsumption of labour under capital what we have discussed earlier, viz., the takeover by capital of a mode of labour developed before the emergence of capitalist relations. The latter as a form of compulsion by which surplus labour is enacted by extending the duration of labour time -- a mode of compulsion not based on personal relations of domination and dependency but simply on differing economic functions this is common to both forms. However, the specifically capitalist mode of production has yet other methods of exacting surplus value at its disposal. But given a pre-existing mode of labour, i.e. an established development of the productive power of labour and a mode of labour corresponding to this productive power, surplus value can be created only by lengthening the working day, i.e., by increasing absolute surplus value. In the formal subsumption of labour under capital, this is the sole manner of producing surplus value.

p 1024 -- "With the production of relative surplus-value the entire real form of production is altered and a specifically capitalist form of production comes into being (at the technological level too). Based on this, and simultaneously with it, the corresponding relation of production between the various agents of production and above all between the capitalist and the wage labourer, come into being for the first time.

11/ For a clear analysis of 'internal labour markets' and their role as a separate analytic category, see Richard C. Edwards "The Social Relations of Production in the Firm and Labour Market Structure" in R.C.Edwards, Michael Reich and David M.Gordon "Labour Market Segmentation" -- Lexington Books 1973.

12/ I refer here to the work of Claude Meillassoux -- "From Reproduction to Production: a Marxist approach to economic anthropology" in Harold Wolpe (edited) "The Articulation of the Modes of Production", Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1980.

****